

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

Somerset Arts Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	18
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Somerset Arts Academy

1700 N KROME AVE, Homestead, FL 33030

www.somersetcityarts.com

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Somerset Arts Academy is to develop flexible leaders who continuously grow through diverse learning opportunities that promote meaningful connections through the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Somerset City Arts is to build 21st-century lifelong leaders who are creative, collaborative, innovative and resilient.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Suarez, Idalia	Principal	The principal oversees the overall functioning of the school concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. The principal will evaluate the effectiveness of the leadership team and staff by conducting walkthroughs, observations, and data chats. The principal will conduct weekly leadership team meetings to discuss data, curriculum, and concerns across all grade levels and content areas.
Rodriguez, Laura	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will support the principal in areas concerning personnel, facilities, academics, activities, and budget. Together, with the principal, the AP will evaluate the effectiveness of the schools academic program through walkthroughs, weekly monitoring of lesson plans, teacher professionalism, communication, and teacher observations.
Lorenzo, Nicole	Instructional Coach	As instructional coach, she will provide immediate support across grade levels in all subject areas. She will help support the implementation of the school wide reading, writing, math, science and STEM academic programs as well as model and provide feedback and resources to assist teachers. Additionally, the instructional coach works closely with the principal and assistant principal in making school decisions, assists in parent meetings to communicate student performance and participates in data chats with teachers to guide instructional practices.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Involving stakeholders in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) development process is crucial for its success. Through our EESAC meetings, we invite stakeholders including the school leadership team, teachers, school staff, parents, students and business or community leaders to discuss the school's data (academic & School climate surveys) and goals for the year. During these sessions stakeholders are provided with opportunities to share their thoughts, ideas, and concerns. After gathering input, the school administration needs to carefully analyze the feedback received from stakeholders. Once the SIP is created using the feedback and data, it is presented to stakeholders for revising and to ensure that the stakeholders' perspectives are reflected in the final plan. After considering the stakeholders' feedback, the school administration finalizes the SIP. This includes incorporating any necessary revisions or additions based on the input received. Throughout the year, updates on our progress are presented and additional feedback is solicited from stakeholders.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Throughout the year, the school's leadership team will meet regularly to discuss current progress towards the goals outlined in the SIP to ensure implementation is effective and impacts are evident on academic progress. If revisions are necessary, due to progress or feedback, the team will meet & solicit input from stakeholders to make any needed revisions to the plan.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT)

	Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<p align="center">School Grades History</p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: A
	2019-20: B
	2018-19: B
	2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	7	6	5	3	8	0	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	6	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	11	10	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	7	14	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	64	50	28	3	15	0	0	0	160

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	10	4	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	9	19	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	10	4	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	9	19	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	61	60	53	62	62	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				72			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				77			40		
Math Achievement*	55	66	59	60	58	50	37		
Math Learning Gains				78			19		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			13		
Science Achievement*	49	58	54	40	64	59	27		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					63	52			
Graduation Rate					53	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	63	59	70			49		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	524
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	1	1
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	87			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	55			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	54			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	65			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	63			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	61			55			49					75
SWD	25			18			8				5	61
ELL	51			51			23				5	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			29							2	
HSP	56			54			36				5	75
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	89			71			100				3	
FRL	54			50			41				5	77

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	72	77	60	78	65	40					70
SWD	41	69	83	45	62	64	13					57
ELL	49	76	64	44	72		27					70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	58	72	76	57	77	71	36					71
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	91	85		78	92							
FRL	59	70	73	57	75	68	38					66

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	59	56	40	37	19	13	27					49
SWD	24	44	40	16	24		7					44
ELL	45	69		18	13		33					49
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	55	57	38	32	19	17	20					50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	45		57	18		55					
FRL	57	61	46	34	23	17	22					48

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	58%	9%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	50%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	57%	63%	-6%	59%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	75%	64%	11%	61%	14%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	58%	-13%	55%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	50%	-5%	51%	-6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

For the 22-23 school year, our 5th grade math showed the lowest performance with 46% proficiency, which could be attributed to a change in instructional staff, new testing platform & new state standards.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our 3rd grade showed the greatest decline by dropping to 58% which could be attributed to a change in instructional staff, new testing platform & new state standards.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our 5th grade math scored 11% below the state average on 55% proficiency. This could be attributed to a change in instructional staff, new testing platform & new state standards and learning gaps caused by the change in standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our K-2nd Grade Reading, based on i-Ready needs analysis, showed the most improvement in foundation skills. Last year, we implemented a new K-2nd reading curriculum, Magnetic Foundations, which provided students with a better foundation in reading over our previous curriculum.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Truancy

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Truancy
2. Reading proficiency K-2nd
3. Math proficiency
4. Science proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

As per our EWS data analysis, we identified an increase in truancy. Last year, we had 7.5% of students truant (18 or more absences). Our goal is to decrease to decrease by at least 3% the number of truant students for the 23-24 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to decrease to decrease by at least 3% the number of truant students for the 23-24 school year.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Review attendance daily. Review Truancy reports bi-weekly. Schedule parent conference with administration and counselor prior to having 10 absences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Laura Rodriguez (lrodriguez@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our school implements the Leader In Me program as our social-emotional learning which will work towards improving attendance. We also implement classroom attendance incentives for each month.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Having a positive school-wide culture around attendance supports student motivation to attend school daily.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review of truancy report.

Person Responsible: Laura Rodriguez (lrodriguez@somersetcityarts.com)

By When: Bi-weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on our 22-23 AP3 i-ready data, our K-2nd grade students showed that 26% of students were below grade level in Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school goal is to increase our K-2nd grade Reading Proficiency on i-Ready AP3, from 74% to 78%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The leadership team will conduct classroom observations to observe differentiated instruction taking place in the classroom. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers to see progress and areas of need. Assessment and progress monitoring data will be assess and analyzed to determine how student are responding to instruction and identify needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our school will focus on effectively implementing differentiated instruction using Magnetic Foundations as well as data driven instruction. This data driven instruction will assist in closing learning gaps by using targeted instruction to meet the needs of our students. This implementation will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as progress monitoring assessment data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Due to the learning gaps identified in our diagnostic assessments, it is imperative that we provide targeted instruction to close these gaps and increase reading proficiency. By implementing differentiated instruction, teachers will be able to meet the needs of all students and provided necessary instruction at their levels.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment to identify students for intervention

Person Responsible: Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

By When: 9/30/2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

After analyzing the assessment data, while we have made improvements in math proficiency, it is still an area of need for our school. Our 5th grade math subgroup was our lowest performing group.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school's overall math proficiency in 5th grade will increase by 3% as measured by the FAST.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This implementation will be monitored through the checking of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs, grade level planning sessions, as well as assessment data and usage of Envision online assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

We are implementing a new curriculum, enVision Florida Math and DI support with push-ins from a paraprofessional.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In order to increase proficiency this strategy will increase rigor and deeper understanding for students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Completion of i-Ready AP1 diagnostic to identify students in need of support.

Person Responsible: Nicole Lorenzo (nlorenzo@somersetcityarts.com)

By When: 9/30/2023

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP is disseminated to stakeholders during our EESAC meetings. The SIP is also posted on our school website.

https://www.somersetcityarts.com/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=467013&type=d&termREC_ID=&pREC_ID=934280

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school builds a positive relationship with parents, families and community stakeholders through our various events & activities that include: EESAC meetings, Coffee Talks, Leadership Day, Student Led Conferences, Parent Workshops, Calendar & communication platforms.

https://www.somersetcityarts.com/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=467013&type=d&termREC_ID=&pREC_ID=934280

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school plans to strengthen the academic program by implementing rigorous, research based curriculum & instructional strategies. The learning time is scheduled in accordance with the district pupil progression plan and interruptions are kept to a minimum. In addition, gifted courses are provided to students that have met the criteria for the program. Problem-based learning and STEAM is also included with in our master schedule to provide students will enrichment.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A